

In the United States Court of Federal Claims
OFFICE OF SPECIAL MASTERS
No. 18-1228V
UNPUBLISHED

MARY MCNALLY,

Petitioner,

v.

SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND
HUMAN SERVICES,

Respondent.

Chief Special Master Corcoran

Filed: January 13, 2020

Special Processing Unit (SPU);
Damages Decision Based on Proffer;
Influenza (Flu) Vaccine; Shoulder
Injury Related to Vaccine
Administration (SIRVA)

Bridget Candace McCullough, Muller Brazil, LLP, Dresher, PA, for petitioner.

Althea Walker Davis, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC, for respondent.

DECISION AWARDING DAMAGES¹

On August 16, 2018, Mary McNally filed a petition for compensation under the National Vaccine Injury Compensation Program, 42 U.S.C. §300aa-10, *et seq.*,² (the “Vaccine Act”). Petitioner alleges that she suffered a shoulder injury related to vaccine administration (“SIRVA”) as a result of an influenza (“flu”) vaccination administered on November 4, 2016. Petition at 1. The case was assigned to the Special Processing Unit of the Office of Special Masters.

On January 13, 2020, a ruling on entitlement was issued, finding Petitioner entitled to compensation for a SIRVA. On January 8, 2020, Respondent filed a proffer on award of compensation (“Proffer”) indicating Petitioner should be awarded \$71,851.19 (comprised of \$70,000.00 for actual pain and suffering and \$1,851.19 for past unreimbursable expenses). Proffer at Respondent’s Rule 4(c) Report and Proffer.

¹ Because this unpublished ruling contains a reasoned explanation for the action in this case, I am required to post it on the United States Court of Federal Claims’ website in accordance with the E-Government Act of 2002. 44 U.S.C. § 3501 note (2012) (Federal Management and Promotion of Electronic Government Services). **This means the ruling will be available to anyone with access to the internet.** In accordance with Vaccine Rule 18(b), Petitioner has 14 days to identify and move to redact medical or other information, the disclosure of which would constitute an unwarranted invasion of privacy. If, upon review, I agree that the identified material fits within this definition, I will redact such material from public access.

² National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act of 1986, Pub. L. No. 99-660, 100 Stat. 3755. Hereinafter, for ease of citation, all “§” references to the Vaccine Act will be to the pertinent subparagraph of 42 U.S.C. § 300aa (2012).

In the Proffer, Respondent represented that Petitioner agrees with the proffered award. *Id.* Based on the record as a whole, I find that Petitioner is entitled to an award as stated in the Proffer.

Pursuant to the terms stated in the Proffer, **I award Petitioner a lump sum payment of \$\$71,851.19 (comprised of \$70,000.00 for actual pain and suffering and \$1,851.19 for past unreimbursable expenses) in the form of a check payable to Petitioner.** This amount represents compensation for all damages that would be available under § 15(a).

The clerk of the court is directed to enter judgment in accordance with this decision.³

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Brian H. Corcoran

Brian H. Corcoran
Chief Special Master

³ Pursuant to Vaccine Rule 11(a), entry of judgment can be expedited by the parties' joint filing of notice renouncing the right to seek review.